

EXHIBIT 449

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

- - -

IN RE: NATIONAL	:	
PRESCRIPTION	:	MDL No. 2804
OPIATE LITIGATION	:	
	:	Case No.
	:	1:17-MD-2804
THIS DOCUMENT RELATES	:	
TO ALL CASES	:	Hon. Dan A. Polster

- - -

Monday, January 7, 2019

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO FURTHER
CONFIDENTIALITY REVIEW

- - -

Videotaped deposition of TOM NAMETH, held at
the offices of Cavitch, Familo & Durkin,
1300 East Ninth Street, Cleveland, Ohio, commencing at
9:03 a.m., on the above date, before Carol A. Kirk,
Registered Merit Reporter and Notary Public.

- - -

GOLKOW LITIGATION SERVICES
877.370.3377 ph | 917.591.5672 fax
deps@golkow.com

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 110</p> <p>1 the IT side.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Was there ever any</p> <p>3 discussion about whether a report like that</p> <p>4 would be useful in detecting and halting</p> <p>5 diversion in its tracks?</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. All right. We're going to</p> <p>8 turn to what Mr. Knoll is going to mark as</p> <p>9 Exhibit 3.</p> <p>10 MR. MULLIGAN: Actually, you know</p> <p>11 what, before we get there, Jon, I've got</p> <p>12 a couple questions. So mark it and</p> <p>13 we'll just --</p> <p>14 BY MR. MULLIGAN:</p> <p>15 Q. You'd agree, Mr. Nameth, that</p> <p>16 patient and customer safety are DDM's first</p> <p>17 priority?</p> <p>18 A. I would agree.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Along with maybe staying in</p> <p>20 business?</p> <p>21 A. Well ...</p> <p>22 Q. Is that fair?</p> <p>23 A. I would say that we have a</p> <p>24 responsibility to our customers' patients, yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 112</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. And so let's talk about</p> <p>2 this a little more.</p> <p>3 Did that system have to prevent</p> <p>4 diversion or simply identify it and respond to</p> <p>5 it after the fact; do you know?</p> <p>6 A. Well, it would prevent diversion</p> <p>7 as far as looking at the system and knowing</p> <p>8 whether it was diversion or not. If it wasn't,</p> <p>9 then it wouldn't be diversion.</p> <p>10 Q. Your report would only allow you</p> <p>11 to identify it had already happened --</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. -- which would then potentially</p> <p>14 enable you to try and stop it in the future,</p> <p>15 right?</p> <p>16 A. Well, but by following up,</p> <p>17 wouldn't we be actually looking at that</p> <p>18 particular issue?</p> <p>19 Q. Well, you tell me.</p> <p>20 A. Yes. I mean, we would look at a</p> <p>21 particular issue and follow up with a written</p> <p>22 report and find out whether it was diversion or</p> <p>23 not. So ...</p> <p>24 Q. But you'd agree that that's</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 111</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. Do you agree that DDM as a</p> <p>2 handler of controlled substance also has an</p> <p>3 obligation to the general public to prevent</p> <p>4 diversion of opioids?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. And would you agree that</p> <p>7 DDM was legally required to implement a system</p> <p>8 of effective controls to prevent diversion?</p> <p>9 A. We were required to have a system.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. To prevent diversion,</p> <p>11 correct?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. And not to respond to it,</p> <p>14 right?</p> <p>15 A. Well, now, you're getting into --</p> <p>16 we felt our system was adequate for what we</p> <p>17 needed to be done.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. And what you needed to be</p> <p>19 done is defined by the Controlled Substances</p> <p>20 Act, right?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And you're a pharmacist, and you</p> <p>23 know that, right?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 113</p> <p>1 identifying that diversion has already happened,</p> <p>2 so it's not actually preventing diversion,</p> <p>3 agree?</p> <p>4 A. What it is, it's -- in my opinion,</p> <p>5 it's preventing diversion by looking at the</p> <p>6 system and determining whether there's diversion</p> <p>7 or not. What you're asking is, are you going to</p> <p>8 stop an order before it went out the door?</p> <p>9 Q. Correct.</p> <p>10 A. No, it did not.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. So it potentially was a</p> <p>12 tool that could put you on notice that diversion</p> <p>13 had already occurred and then give you the</p> <p>14 option to try and stem it or prevent it in the</p> <p>15 future, correct?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. And you guys never</p> <p>18 identified a suspicious order, right?</p> <p>19 A. Right.</p> <p>20 Q. And so you never determined that</p> <p>21 any diversion was taking place regarding</p> <p>22 suspicious orders, right?</p> <p>23 A. Right.</p> <p>24 Q. And so, therefore, you guys didn't</p>